



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.            | CONFIRMATION NO.       |
|--|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/688,406   | 10/17/2003  | Keith A. Thuerk      | BOC9-2003-0034 (403)           | 1299                   |
| 40987  | 7590        | 07/21/2009           |                                |                        |
| Novak Druce + Quigg LLP<br>CityPlace Tower, 525 Okeechobee Blvd.<br>Fifteenth-Floor<br>WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33401 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>ULRICH, NICHOLAS S |                        |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>2173               | PAPER NUMBER           |
|  |             |                      | MAIL DATE<br>07/21/2009        | DELIVERY MODE<br>PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/688,406

**Applicant(s)**

THUERK, KEITH A.

**Examiner**

NICHOLAS S. ULRICH

**Art Unit**

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2009.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-10, 27 and 28 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-10, 27, and 28 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

#### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 4-10, 27, and 28 are pending.
2. Claim 1 is amended.
3. Claims 2, 3, and 11-26 are cancelled.
4. Claims 27 and 28 are new.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 4-7, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Perry et al. (US 7020696 B1).

In regard to claim 1, Perry discloses a computer implemented method for customizing a display of system services within an administrative interface comprising the steps of:  
categorizing system services into functional categories based on functions of the system services (*Column 21 lines 59-61 and column 21 line 54-Column 22 line 56*);

establishing a plurality of system service profiles based on functional roles of users, each system service profile representing a customized subset of the system services (*Column 47 lines 27-44 and Column 45 lines 17-60*);

detecting a request for the presentation of system services from a user (*Column 50 lines 39-47*);

ascertaining an identity of the user and at least one functional role associated with the user (*Column 50 lines 39-47*);

determining at least one of said system service profiles corresponding to the at least one functional role of the user (*Column 50 lines 39-47*);

determining at least one system service to be displayed in accordance with the at least one determined system service profile (*Column 47 lines 25-50 and Column 49 lines 14-19*);

and displaying the determined at least one system service within the administrative interface in a manner that the determined at least one system service is navigable based on the functional categories of the determined at least one system service, the at least one determined system service profile corresponding to the user and computing devices providing the determined at least one system service (*Column 21 lines 59-61 and column 21 line 54-Column 22 line 56, column 47 lines 26-30, column 56 lines 33-42, and col. 57 lines 1-13*).

In regard to claims 4 and 5, Perry discloses further comprising the steps of

categorizing said system services by computing device (*Column 19 lines 25-29*);

In regard to claim 6, Perry discloses said establishing step further comprising the step of:

providing a system services configuration interface so that authorized users can modify at least one system service profile (*Column 48 lines 9-11*).

In regard to claim 7, Perry discloses said providing step further comprising the steps of:

providing a series of views to perform a task relating to at least one system service profile in a step-wise fashion, whereby said series of views represent a system service profile configuration wizard (*Column 48 lines 9-19*).

In regard to claim 27, machine readable storage claim 27 corresponds generally to method claim 1 and recites similar features and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to claim 28, system claim 28 corresponds generally to method claim 1 and recites similar features and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry et al. (US 7020696 B1) in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary (Microsoft Press, 2002).

In regard to claim 10, while Perry teaches providing service profiles and listing the services associated with those profiles, Perry fails to disclose integrating the service profiles with a directory service of an operating system including a Microsoft Active Directory.

However, the Microsoft Computer Dictionary teaches an active directory that is designed to enable applications to find, use, and manage directory resources including user names and permissions (*Microsoft Computer Dictionary pg 16*). It would have been obvious at the time of invention to those skilled in the art, to incorporate the teachings of Microsoft Computer Dictionary and integrate service profiles within an active directory. The motivation would be to simplify directory-related activities associated with locating and administering network users and resources as taught by Microsoft Computer Dictionary (*pg 16*).

7. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry et al. (US 7020696 B1) with reference to Background section of present invention.

In regard to claim 8, Perry fails to disclose the system services are Microsoft system services that execute within a Microsoft Windows type operating system.

However, the background section of the present invention discloses Microsoft system services. Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to include system services which are Microsoft system services. The motivation would be to manage system services as disclosed by the background section of the present invention.

In regard to claim 9, Perry fails to disclose presenting system services within a graphical user interface included within the Microsoft Configuration Utility.

However, the background section of the present invention discloses the Microsoft Configuration Utility, which is used for managing system services. Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to present system services within the Microsoft Configuration Utility. The motivation would be to manage system services as disclosed by the background section of the present invention.

### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed 5/04/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regard to applicants' arguments that Perry fails to disclose categorizing system services into functional categories based on functions of the system services, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., functional categories include printer, email, storage, and the like) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The claims must be interpreted by their broadest reasonable interpretation. Currently the claims recite "categorizing system services into functional categories based on functions of the system services". As taught by Perry, system services are categorized into functional categories corresponding to Modules, Ports, and SONET interface, see Perry col. 21 line 54- col. 23 line 26. As shown in Fig 4F element 897 and described in col. 21 line 1-4, the status window is used to display current configuration and service provisioning details. The Modules, Ports and SONET tabs are included in this window thus categorizing system services into groups corresponding to Modules, Ports, and SONET interfaces.

9. In regard to applicants argument that Perry fails to disclose displaying the determined at least one system service within the administrative interface in a manner that the determined at least one system service is navigable based on the functional



categories of the determined at least one system service, the at least one determined system service profile corresponding to the user, and computing devices providing the determined at least one system service, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

Perry teaches in col. 47 lines 26-30 that profiles are used to provide customized graphical user interfaces to individual users. Perry teaches in col. 56 lines 33-42 that a users profile is used to display the customized graphical user interface. Therefore, the system service is navigable based on the determined system service profile. As discussed throughout the specification, a users profile designates what the interface will display to the user. The interface can be managed so that only a subset of services are provided to the user. So when a profile for the user is established, the interface will only provide services that the user has access to. Perry further teaches in col. 57 lines 1-13, that selection of a tab in the displayed graphical user interface provides the user with data corresponding to the network device and selected tab. As previously discussed, the tabs represent categorized system services. Therefore, the system services are navigable based on functional categories and computing devices providing the system services. Selecting a tab presents to the user services within the tab (SONET, Ports, Modules services) corresponding to a selected network device. Since Perry teaches navigating based on functional categories of the system service, determined system service profile, and computing device providing the system service, Perry teaches the limitation in question.

***Conclusion***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NICHOLAS S. ULRICH whose telephone number is (571)270-1397. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 9:00 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kieu Vu can be reached on (571)272-4057. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tadesse Hailu/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173

Nicholas Ulrich  
7/12/2009  
2173